

# Making the Case for School, Family, and Community Partnerships: Recommendations for Research

*Nancy Feyl Chavkin*

## Abstract

Despite the overwhelming support for partnerships, the research base on the effectiveness of partnerships is not clear. This article examines the current status of partnerships in the literature, reviews the research on partnerships, and makes recommendations for future research. The author offers the nine key recommendations as first steps in helping further the research agenda. These recommendations include: beginning with multiple, detailed case-studies; defining terms precisely; being clear about the outcomes; understanding the theory of the school-family-community partnership and the partnership activities; involving participants in the research; isolating specific parts of partnerships in the studies; using objective measures; considering levels of intervention; and recognizing unanticipated benefits.

---

## Introduction

With the United States Department of Education offering a webpage devoted to the Partnership for Family Involvement in Education and the National Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk (CRESPAR) working on learning how to "scale up" good partnership prac-

*The School Community Journal*, Vol. 8, No. 1, Spring/Summer 1998

tices, "partnership" seems to be the buzzword of the nineties. In addition, The Goals 2000: Educate America Act and the change in eligibility for Title I funding requiring school-family "compacts" represent major national legislation that has pushed partnerships to the forefront of national priorities. At the local level, educators have joined the movement enthusiastically by expanding traditional parent involvement programs to include community collaborations and partnerships. Despite this seemingly universal acceptance of partnerships, a key question remains: Can we make a case for school, family, and community partnerships based on research? We need to know if there is a research basis for promoting school, family, and community partnerships, and if there is not one, we need to develop a sound research agenda to make the case. We need to go further than just finding out if school, family, and community partnerships are helping education; we also need to know how, when, and which parts of the partnership are improving education. Otherwise, these valuable school, family, and community partnerships will become just another educational fad before we have used them effectively.

The intent of this article is to explore what we have learned about school, family, and community partnerships from research and what we still need to learn. Having worked in the education community for more than twenty-five years and being actively involved in several partnerships, I was inquisitive about what the research literature was telling the public about the value of school, family, and community partnerships. I began the search for answers by going first to very accessible journal and periodical literature and then proceeding to the academic researchers. This article contains both a description of the search for answers and a summary of the major recommendations. Because of the overwhelming increase in the number of educational partnerships and their widespread acceptance as educational solutions, we have reached a critical point. It is now time for closer scrutiny about the status of the research agenda.

## Terminology

The Random House Dictionary of the English Language (1987) defines partnership as "the state or condition of being a partner; participation; association; joint interest" (p. 1415), but the word means many different things to people. Synonyms include words such as coalition, collaboration, cooperation, alliance, association, affiliation, merger, and connection. Franklin and Streeter (1995) make the point that different words describe different levels of commitment. Their conceptualization puts the word "partnership" in the middle of a five-part continuum (informal relations, coordination, partnership, collaboration, and integration) where participants move from little or no change in the basic philosophy of the system to systemic change in how all the participants operate. For this article, partnership is defined according to

Franklin and Streeter's definition; i.e. when schools, families, and communities have agreed to work together with a formal plan to develop initiatives that will improve education.

Research and evaluation are two different terms, but they are closely linked and will not be separated in this article. Although one might argue that evaluation is conducted in a more value-laden, political context, educational evaluation and research are both conducted with the goal of studying the design, process, and effects of interventions.

## The Current Status of Partnerships

I went to the major databases for educational research studies and descriptions of partnerships and was at first overwhelmed by the number of times the word "partnership" turned up on the computer screen. On the first request for articles in the ERIC literature from 1986-97, the result was 6,187 documents containing the word "partnership." Obviously, that was too broad of a search term, and thus the term was further narrowed by adding "educational partnerships," "community partnerships," "research," and "evaluation." Still, the database yielded more than 800 articles. It was only when the terms were delimited to school, family, or community partnerships and research or evaluation that the numbers of articles became more manageable.

After the initial search of the ERIC literature, I had high expectations of finding many thoughtful studies on the research and evaluation of school, family, and community partnerships. This enthusiasm did not last long. When I started to read the studies, something was missing. Despite the fact that words such as "research" or "evaluation" were in the titles or subject listings, these articles were primarily editorial-type articles touting the benefits of partnerships without any mention of specific research or evaluation studies. Many of the articles were descriptions of one partnership in a community; these articles contained glowing praises of the results that were going to happen. Sometimes there were brief case studies or vignettes, but rarely were any specific research designs or evaluations presented. The word partnership was indeed a "buzzword," but there were few studies documenting how the partnership was responsible for students' success. I went on to several additional databases including the periodical literature only to find the same pattern of descriptive or editorial articles.

After eliminating duplicate articles, I examined 125 articles from 1990-97 that appeared in journal or periodical literature with the terms school, family, or community partnership and research or evaluation, in the title or subject. Interestingly, 91 (72.8%) of these articles were opinions and summaries of several partnership programs with reputed success. Another 31 articles (24.8%) were descriptions of individual partnership programs, and

only 3 (2.4%) were actual research-based articles. Obviously, the research literature is not located in the periodical and journal databases; these sources contain primarily descriptive and editorial (opinion) articles.

Recognizing the many limitations of this initial (and non-exhaustive) search of the journal and periodical literature, I decided to see what other researchers had to say about the research in the field of school-family-community partnerships. I believed that my search was too cursory and invalid because I had not searched the elusive literature found in reports and non-published sources and had not included books in the search. Perhaps my terms were not appropriate or perhaps the databases were not inclusive of all the research studies. For a field so prominent in the public agenda, I conjectured that there must be a strong research base that I had not located.

## Reviews of Partnership Research

Upon further search, I discovered that many of the research reviews of partnerships are embedded in an elusive set of literature that carries a variety of titles such as collaborative services, family involvement, partnerships, school-linked services, comprehensive programs, and integrated delivery systems. Many of the writings are either advocacy such as Schorr's 1988 *Within Our Reach: Breaking the Cycle of Disadvantage* or how-to-do-it manuals such as Melaville and Blank's 1993 *Together We Can: A Guide to Crafting Community-based, Family-Centered Strategies for Integrating Education and Human Services*. There are several national reports (e.g. National Association of State Boards of Education, 1991; Council of Chief State School Officers, 1991; National School Board Association, 1988) or calls for action such as the present America Goes to School, Family Involvement Partnership for Learning initiative that includes more than 140 family, school, community, religious, and business organizations supporting educational partnerships.

Knapp (1995) uses the term "thin" to describe the methodology literature to date about how to study partnerships, and his view was supported by my beginning search of the literature. Dryfoos (1994) in *Full Service Schools*, working in the field of school-linked services, and Weiss and Greene (1992), working in the field of family support, were some of the first to argue that the traditional methodological approaches are not appropriate for partnership literature. Recently, the Harvard Family Research Project (1997) published an annotated bibliography, *The Guide to Results-Based Accountability*, in order to keep abreast of new ideas in the area of research on collaborative efforts. Much of this literature is also reports from national organizations (e.g. Council of Governors' Policy Advisors, 1991; National Center for Service Integration, 1994; Improved Outcomes for Children Project and the Center for the Study of Social Policy, 1995).

To narrow my search, to the area of school-family-community partnerships, I began by re-reading a familiar and widely-cited report on a closely related topic, family involvement in education, by Henderson and Berla (1995). In *The Family is Critical to Student Achievement*, Henderson and Berla updated two earlier publications from 1981 and 1987 on the research literature regarding family involvement and student achievement and concluded that “the field has become a growth industry.” Indeed, they found many more reports of a positive correlation between family involvement in education and increases in student achievement. Don Davies, the former president of the Institute for Responsive Education, praised the report for providing a compilation of research in “a succinct, readable and credible fashion.”

The 66 studies that Henderson and Berla report on cover the following: programs and interventions at the early childhood/preschool, elementary school, and high school level; school policies, and family processes such as family behavior and background and family relations with school. The authors state that the studies strongly suggest that family involvement in education leads to student success in school and in life. They report that the studies clearly document benefits for students, families, schools, and communities.

Next, I found authors who differed somewhat with Henderson and Berla’s conclusion about the strength of the family involvement research. Baker and Soden (1997) took an evaluative look at the family involvement in education literature when they reviewed 211 articles (66 non-empirical and 145 empirical papers). They found much-promising theory but significant gaps in the research. The 145 empirical studies were evaluated according to four methodological issues: (1) design; (2) isolation of parent involvement from other treatment effects; (3) the definition of parent involvement; and (4) the use of objective measures to assess parent involvement.

Baker and Soden (1997) looked at each of the designs in the empirical studies using the seven threats to internal validity described by Campbell and Stanley (1963) and found that most of the research contained serious flaws. Only three experimental studies employed randomized procedures. They also considered the extent to which the variable of parent involvement efforts was isolated from other kinds of adult involvement or from other aspects of an intervention or program. In addition, the researchers examined the definition of parent involvement. Very few studies had the same operational definition; some studies focused on behaviors and others on attitudes or parenting styles. Lastly, Baker and Soden considered whether the research used objective measurement or merely self-report. Only about 25% of the studies used observation, attendance records, or participation reports; the other 75% used self-report or teacher-report.

Baker and Soden (1997) offer seven specific suggestions and one overarching recommendation for future research in family involvement that

could be extended to research about school, family, community partnerships. Based on their comprehensive and critical review of the literature on family involvement and student achievement, they suggest the following: use of experimental procedures; isolation of the specific effects of parent involvement; clarification of operational definition; objective measurement of parent behavior; accurate representation of family influences; examination of differential effects of gender; and analysis of complex patterns of association.

Baker and Soden's overarching recommendation for future research concerns specifying optimal parent involvement. They believe that their critical review of the literature highlights the need for refining both the theory and the analyses of parent involvement. They suggest that there are key areas that need greater specificity such as the optimal location, amount, and range of parent involvement and who the beneficiaries of parent involvement are. Although they focused on the narrower field of family involvement rather than more complex school-family-community partnerships, their work suggests the need to be clear about the connection between the theory of parent involvement and the types and levels of family involvement and the outcomes desired.

Two other researchers, Knapp (1995) and Epstein (1996) wrote about the problems with evaluating partnerships. Knapp wrote about the general field of complex, comprehensive services, and Epstein wrote specifically about school, family, and community partnerships.

Knapp's 1995 provocative article in *Educational Researcher* was titled with a question: How shall we study comprehensive, collaborative services for children and families? He presented five sets of issues that are critical to researchers and evaluators of family-school-community partnership partnerships. These issues include: (1) divergent participants' perspectives; (2) the independent variable; (3) the outcome; (4) attribution; and (5) the study process. These issues are critical to understanding partnerships.

Knapp says that we must first learn how to work with the many different groups that are involved with the partnership. Addressing this first issue is not simple because often different disciplines are involved and there are differences between those who are doing the research and those who are being studied. Many times there are political and contextual issues to consider because most school, family, and community partnerships are inherently public. The second issue, what Knapp refers to as "the elusive independent variable," is also difficult. The word partnership has different meanings to different people — sometimes it is linked to coordination, sometimes collaboration, sometimes joint or shared services. Partnerships are also supposed to be flexible and changing to meet the needs of the client. What exactly is the independent variable? And if the independent variable is confusing, then what about the third issue, the dependent variable or the out-

come? Is the outcome academic achievement, social well-being, an improved school climate, or a stronger partnership? There are many more possibilities for outcomes. The fourth issue, attribution, is always a difficult one for researchers. Can we be sure that it is the partnership causing the improvement in outcome? When will we be able to make confident claims about the effects of partnerships? The fifth issue, the relationship between the researchers and participants in a partnership, is not an impossible issue, but it can make the relationship between participants and service providers more complex and intrusive.

Epstein (1996) takes a positive perspective as she examines the history of history of research and policy on school, family, and community partnerships. Calling partnerships "an emerging field of study," she looked at studies from the late 1960s and early 1970s, during which time the argument was whether schools or families were more important. In addition to the change in the nature of the debate, there were changes in family and community conditions that were in response to poverty, demographics, family demands, equity, and excellence. She notes the changes in the research community by discussing the National Center on Families, Communities, Schools, and Children's Learning, the International Network of more than 300 scholars who gathered to share work on this topic, and the need for the American Education Research Association (AERA) to add multiple labels to index presentations on school, family, and community partnerships. AERA's Families as Educators Special Interest Group (recently renamed The Family, School, Community Partnerships Special Interest Group) has grown in membership for more than a decade, and every major social science and policy-related professional association has included the topic of partnerships at its annual meeting, often with panels and research teams from interdisciplinary perspectives.

Epstein also calls the study of a school, family, and community partnerships "a maturing field" which will "generate heat as well as light" (p. 212). She feels the emerging field of school, family, community partnerships is strengthened by three characteristics of the participants and their work. First, because the academic disciplinary boundaries have blended, the research has improved our understanding of this complex issue. Second, because professional boundaries have blurred, practitioners, policymakers, and researchers are learning more from each other and the very nature of how research is designed, conducted, and interpreted has changed. Third, the research questions have changed for the better. We are no longer asking if families are important; we are now acknowledging that families and communities are important and asking how can they work together so that students benefit the most.

## Recommendations

This author's cursory look at the partnership literature falls far short of what is needed if we are to understand the relationship between research and evaluation studies and school-family-community partnerships. What this general literature did show, however, was enthusiastic support for partnerships. The educational researchers with their reviews of existing literature tell us we have much more to learn about the complex nature of partnerships. The authors all agreed that we did not know enough about school-family-community involvement, but they differed on exactly how we should make the case for school, family, and community partnerships. The following nine recommendations are offered as first steps in helping further the research agenda.

### **Multiple, detailed case-studies are an appropriate beginning.**

Because school, family, community partnerships deal with complex relationships, they demand a baseline of repeated measures. Descriptions of both individual participation and of partnership participation are needed. These two descriptions are similar yet different; the former focuses on individuals and families and the latter on the program and partnership work. Partnership research needs to begin with descriptive studies and case histories and then moving forward with longitudinal and controlled studies. Knapp (1995) says that the constructive skeptic never believes that a partnership will actually accomplish what it says it will do, and thus a good design calls for a baseline of repeated measure over time prior to participation in the partnership and during the partnership. He suggests that researchers can also use single-subject and single-system, time-series research to demonstrate the bottom-line outcomes of partnerships.

### **Define your terms precisely.**

This recommendation was echoed constantly by the reviewers; most of the existing research does not make it clear who or what the "partnership" is. The independent variable of partnership is often not defined clearly. Another problem is the definition of community; how do we find a descriptor of the community we are talking about in our school-family-community partnership? Baker and Soden (1997) suggest that most researchers are not clear about what they mean by terms like "parent involvement." Do they mean reading to children? coming to school? raising funds? There is a need to define optimal partnership activities and describe the locale and range of activities that are included in the partnership.



### **Be clear about the outcomes you are seeking.**

It is critical to specify what results you are seeking with the partnership effort. It needs to be clear whether the goal is student achievement, a better school climate, or more community support. When one looks at results and outcomes, it is important to acknowledge that different types of activities within partnerships lead to different outcomes for students, parents, and educators, especially in the short term. Epstein (1996) makes it clear that working on parenting skills may not be clearly linked with student achievement in the short term, but it may first affect the interaction of families with their children and later affect the student's achievement. Gomby and Larson (1992) provide detailed lists of possible outcomes for the student, the school, the family, and the community, and these can be used as starting points.

### **Understand the relationship between the theory of the school-family-community partnership and the partnership activities.**

The reviewers were in clear agreement on the need for a stronger conceptual base about how partnerships worked and what the relationship of this theory was to specific partnership activities. In the case of school, family, community partnerships, Epstein's (1996) theory of overlapping spheres of influence needs to be clearly articulated and understood by all partners. Epstein's recommendations for research are embedded with the theory of overlapping spheres of influence. Studying points of transition from one grade level to the next or from one school to the next suggests studying the concept of change. Understanding the theory behind the partnership helps design appropriate research and evaluation activities. Examining points of transition and the relationships between spheres of influence calls for something very different than experimental design, which does not allow for the flexibility and constant change inherent in partnerships.

### **Involve participants in partnership research.**

Designing the research collaboratively is another key recommendation that is repeated by the authors. Starting from the "bottom up" helps the researcher understand what is happening in the partnership and receive constructive criticism of the measures and the process being used to collect data. In addition, Epstein (1996) asks, what is the role of the student in this research? The student needs to be considered as an active learner and a variable in the research process. Finally, she says that the concept of how can researchers collaborate with educators and policymakers to make the research meaningful must be considered. Epstein calls for "sharing the role of expert."

### **Isolate the specific parts of partnerships in your studies.**

It will be necessary to isolate the parts of the partnership process at some point in the study in order to examine more fully the role that each part plays in the partnership. For example, it is important to know how well the tutoring program is working, if the mentoring program is effective, or if the business involvement has improved community relations. In addition, Knapp (1995) suggests that researchers look at both quantitative and qualitative analyses of the cost of the partnerships. Recognizing that partnerships are complex, he suggests that cost is a crucial question that gets forgotten because researchers have two difficulties — disentangling partnerships costs from ongoing costs and characterizing what the word “cost” really means to the parts of the partnership.

### **Use objective measures rather than self-report measures whenever possible.**

Baker and Soden (1997) recommended that researchers look beyond self-reports of progress and use objective measures. The limitations on reliability and validity of self-report measures compromise the research on partnerships. In addition to some standardized measures, direct observation can be helpful in counting interactions and documenting behavioral changes. Gomby and Larson (1992) recognize that many partnerships focus on changes in attitudes but caution that changes in attitudes don't always lead to changes in behaviors. They suggest that although self-report paper-and-pencil surveys are easy, they are not always the most predictive of changes.

Keir and Millea (1997), however, caution that programs should not collect data just because it is available. The data may not be closely linked to the outcomes. Partnerships need to be clear about the outcomes they are seeking when they select measures.

### **Consider levels of intervention.**

Some families and community organizations are on the rosters as partners but they do not actively participate in partnership activities. It is important to gauge the differences in these groups. In the School Development Project (SDP), Haynes and Emmons (1997) have come up with a reasonable alternative for evaluation studies; they now determine the level of implementation of SDP-like processes in each school and then proceed with the evaluation. In this way, Haynes and Emmons are able to account for the level of saturation and to truly examine the relationship of the implementation level to student outcomes. Keir and Millea (1997) found that it was critical to distinguish between students who received intensive services in the School of the Future Project and those that received intermittent services; they recom-

mended that programs track the frequency of services.

### **Recognize unanticipated benefits.**

Another promising practice cited by Knapp (1995) is an investigation of success. He suggests that careful study of the typical practices and the conditions that support these practices in exemplary partnerships offers research new perspectives for identifying what is working. In the School of the Future Project, Keir and Millea (1997) describe the unexpected benefits that came from training and involving parents in the data collection process. The goal had been to reach out to parents and to draw them into the project; what happened was that community members with leadership, public speaking, and advocacy emerged. These community members were able to conduct and analyze other surveys in their own community and took on additional community-service responsibilities.

## **Conclusion and Cautionary Note**

Knapp (1995) says that there are several approaches that he doesn't think will work. He believes it is too early for meta-analyses because there are no commonly-defined independent variables or outcome measures. He suggests that correlational investigations using factor-analytic studies will not work well with partnerships because the very nature of the collaborative design leads to many variables being related spuriously. In addition, he believes that it is too early to push for group-comparative experimental studies comparing recipients and non-recipients because the researcher must prove that the treatment is identifiable and uniform and the recipients and nonrecipients are comparable. These kinds of forced research and evaluation studies will change the nature of developing partnerships into more of a scientific experiment than an emerging partnership.

Epstein (1996) suggests that the results of previous studies have laid the groundwork for future research by generating many new questions. She suggests that much more work needs to be done, particularly with clearer questions, better data, stronger measurement models, more refined analyses, and more useful results. She lists five topics that are particularly compelling and need further study. These five topics include the following: examining points of transition within the partnership and within schooling levels as students enter different grade units; exploring the results or consequences of specific partnership activities; defining the components of community; studying the roles of students in their own educational success; and having researchers collaborate with policy leaders and educators.

It is important to bear in mind Kennedy's (1997) conclusion that much of the problem with the gap between research and practice actually "stems

from false expectations" (10). Readers of research often want clear rules of what to do and when to do it. Research has not been able to fulfill that expectation and probably never will. The answer about what kind of research or evaluation is appropriate may depend more on the individual partnership than on predetermined research designs; there is no one easy recipe for every partnership to follow. There are so many political, contextual, and financial issues that impact the kinds of research partnerships can conduct. We cannot forget that many times the partnerships are based on soft money and the creative energy of a small group of dedicated educators; outside factors such as accreditation, funding, and curriculum issues become barriers to the successes of the partnership. Ucelli (1997) commented that "the challenges of partnerships like these are formidable"; conducting research about partnerships in these contexts will be difficult. We will need to keep participants actively involved in the research process beginning with the design, and that new role will not be easy for researchers, educators, families, or community members.

In sum, we do not yet have a strong research base supporting school-family-community partnerships. If we want to make the case for partnerships, we are going to have to develop new research strategies to do it because partnerships are complex and wreck havoc with the traditional research methodology. We must be cautious as we consider the best ways to evaluate partnerships; the research needs to be appropriate at the current point in the partnership's development. In the words of Gomby and Larson (1992), "Evaluation of school-linked service initiatives, which are characterized by great flexibility and variability, is challenging but also possible and desirable" (68). We can and we must move forward with a research agenda for school, family, community partnerships. Someday soon when citizens go to a periodical database, they will find a rich research base not only about the value of school-family-community partnerships, but about which strategies work best when.

## References

- America goes back to school: A place for families and community.* (1995). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Baker, A. J. L. & Soden, L. M. (1997). *Parent involvement in children's education: A critical assessment of the knowledge base.* New York: National Council of Jewish Women's Center for the Child.
- Brizius, J. A. & Campbell, M. D. (1991). *Getting results: A guide for government accountability.* Washington, DC: Council of Governors' Policy Advisors.
- Campbell, D. T. & Stanley, J. C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research.* Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk (CRESPAR). (1995). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.
- Chynoweth, J. K. & Dyer, B. (1991). *Strengthening families: a guide for state policymaking.* Washington, DC: Council of Governors' Policy Advisors.

- Council of Chief State School Officers. (1991). *Families in school: State strategies and policies to improve family involvement in education*. Washington, DC: author.
- Dryfoos, J. (1994). *Full-service schools: A revolution in health and social services for children, youth, and families*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Epstein, J. L. (1996). Perspectives and previews on research and policy for school, family, and community partnerships. In A. Booth & J. F. Dunn (Eds.), *Family-school links: How do they affect educational outcomes?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Franklin, C. & Streeter, C.L. (1995). School reform: Linking public schools with human services. *Social Work* 40, 773-783.
- Gomby, D. S. & Larson, C. S. (1992). Evaluation of school-linked services. *The Future of Children* 2(1) 68-84.
- Harvard Family Research Project. (1997). *The guide to results-based accountability: Annotated bibliography of publications, web sites, and other resources*. Cambridge, MA: Author.
- Haynes, N. M. & Emmons, C. L. (1997). *Comer School Development Program effects: A ten year review, 1986-96*. New Haven, CT: Yale Child Study Center.
- Henderson, A. T. & Berla, N., Eds. (1995). *The family is critical to student achievement*. 2nd printing. Washington, DC: Center for Law and Education.
- Keir, S. S. & Millea, S. (1997). *Challenges and realities: Evaluating a school-based service project*. Austin, TX: Hogg Foundation for Mental Health.
- Kennedy, M. A. (1997). The connection between research and practice. *Educational Researcher* 26 (7) 4-12.
- Knapp, M. S. (1995). How shall we study comprehensive, collaborative services for children and families? *Educational Researcher* 24 (4) 5-16.
- Melaville, A. I. & Blank, M. J. (1993). *Together we can: A guide for crafting a profamily system of education and human services*. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- Moles, O. C., Ed. (1996). *Reaching all families: Creating family-friendly schools*. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.
- National Association of State Boards of Education. (1991). *Caring communities: Supporting young children and families*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- National School Board Association. (1988). *First teachers: Parent involvement in the public schools*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Schorr, L. (1988). *Within our reach: Breaking the cycle of disadvantage*. New York: Anchor.
- Schorr, L., Farrow, F., Hornbeck, D., & Watson, S. (1995). The case for shifting to results-based accountability with a startup list of outcome measures. Washington, DC: Improved Outcomes for Children Project and the Center for the Study of Social Policy.
- Ucelli, M. (1997). SDP school/university partnerships: A national perspective. *School Development Program Newsline* 5 (3) 13.
- United States Department of Education. Webpage: <http://www.ed.gov>.
- Weiss, H. B. & Greene, J. G. (1992). An empowerment partnership for family support and education programs and evaluation. *Family Science Review* 5 (1) 131-148.
- Young, N., Gardner, S., Coley, S., Schorr, L. & Bruner, C. (1994). *Making a difference: Moving to outcome-based accountability for comprehensive service reforms (Resource Brief No. 7)*. Falls Church, VA: National Center for Service Integration.

---

Nancy Feyl Chavkin, Ph.D., LMSW-AP, is Professor of Social Work and Co-Director of the Center for Children and Families at the School of Health Professions at Southwest Texas State University, San Marcos, Texas.

